

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action dated March 22, 2006. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the remarks that follow. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarification purposes without adding new matter.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-10 are pending.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements.

Claims 6, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification” (Corba).

OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION

The presently claimed invention provides for a computer implemented method of activating a process, said method implemented via computer program code stored in said computer, said method comprising: generating one or more first plug-ins each configured to activate a target process; dynamically registering the first plug-ins with a second plug-in; permanently storing information relating to each registered first plug-in, and activating at least one target process based on said permanently stored information.

The presently claimed invention also provides for a server in a client-server computer system, comprising: a processing unit; and a storage device storing computer program code implementing at least: one or more first plug-ins each configured to activate a target process, and a second plug-in configured to dynamically register the first plug-ins and to permanently store information relating to the registered first plug-ins.

In the Claims

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarification purposes without adding new matter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 6, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As per the Examiner's suggestion, claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarification purposes without adding new matter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification” (Corba). To be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (i.e., Corba) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Additionally, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants’ disclosure (In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As per the arguments presented during the interview of 04/06/2005, and the arguments presented below, Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under U.S.C. § 103.

The cited article “The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification” (hereafter, Corba) outlines the CORBA standard and details how it defines APIs, communication protocol, and object/service information models to enable heterogeneous applications written in various languages running on various platforms to interoperate.

Applicants’ claim 1, by contrast, provides for a computer implemented method of activating a process, said method implemented via computer program code stored in said computer, said method comprising: generating one or more first plug-ins each configured to

activate a target process; dynamically registering the first plug-ins with a second plug-in; permanently storing information relating to each registered first plug-in, and activating at least one target process based on said permanently stored information.

Applicants' claim 6, provides for a server in a client-server computer system, comprising: a processing unit; and a storage device storing computer program code implementing at least: one or more first plug-ins each configured to activate a target process, and a second plug-in configured to dynamically register the first plug-ins and to permanently store information relating to the registered first plug-ins.

The Examiner, in support of the rejection of claim 1, states that Corba in §9.2.3 teaches "POA Creation", which can be equated to claim 1's "one or more first plug-ins". Applicants respectfully assert that Corba in §9.2.3 merely teaches the implementation of a POA objects such as the root POA. Corba in §9.2.3 also specifically state that such "POA objects are not persistent".

The Examiner, in further support of the rejection of claim 1, states that Corba in §9.3.2, §9.3.3, and §9.3.4 teach claim 1's feature of "registering the first plug-ins with a second plug-in". §9.3.2 merely outlines Corba's POAManager interface, wherein each POA object has an associated POAManager object. §9.3.3 merely outlines Corba's AdapterActivator interface, wherein adapter activators are associated with POAs. §9.3.4 merely outlines Corba's ServantManager Interface, wherein the Servant managers are associated with the POAs.

The Examiner, in support of the rejection of claim 1, states that Corba in figure 9-2 and §9.2.3 teaches claim 1's feature of "permanently storing information related to each registered first plug-in". Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. Figure 9-2 merely teaches Corba's architecture and §9.2.3 specifically teaches away from Applicants' invention. Corba in §9.2.3 specifically states that "POA objects are not persistent...No POA state can be assumed to be saved by the ORB". Applicants respectfully assert that the Corba reference provides NO details regarding permanently storing information related to each registered plug-in. Applicants are unsure how the Examiner is interpreting figure 9-2 and §9.2.3 as teaching Applicants' feature of permanently storing information related to each registered first plug-in.

Absent such a teaching, Corba cannot anticipate or render obvious Applicants' claim 1. The above-mentioned arguments substantially apply to independent claim 6. Hence, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection with respect to claims 1 and 6, and further respectfully request allowance thereof.

If the Examiner still feels that that Applicants' features of dynamically registering one or more first plug-ins with a second plug-in and permanently storing information relating to each registered first plug-in are disclosed in Corba, Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that it is the duty of the Examiner to specifically point out each and every limitation of a claim being rejected as per §1.104(c)(2) of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations and section 707 of the M.P.E.P., which explicitly states that "the particular part relied on must be designated" and "the pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified".

The above-mentioned arguments substantially apply to claims 2-5 and 7-10 as they inherit all the features of the claim from they depend from (i.e., claims 1 and 6, respectively). Hence, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection with respect to claims 2-5 and 7-10, and hereby respectfully request allowance thereof.

SUMMARY

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This amendment is being filed with a petition for extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the petition fee, as well as any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 12-0010.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

/ramrajsoundararajan/

Ramraj Soundararajan
Registration No. 53,832

1725 Duke Street
Suite 650
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 838-7683

September 22, 2006